

Appl. No. 09/982,279  
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2006

Docket No. CM01969G  
Customer No. 22917

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 12-13, 15, 16 and 19, have cancelled Claims 5, 11 and 20 and have added new Claims 21-23. No new matter was added by these amendments. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-19 and 21-23 remain in this application.

#### Claim Objections:

Claims 1, 5, 10 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) Regarding claim 1, line 5-7, the relationship among "a set of code channels", "first source device", and "one subsequent transmission pass" is unclear and confusing.
  - b) Regarding claim 1, line 8-11, signal from where is removed is unclear and confusing. A first source device in connection with a first code channel, but remove signal from the first source device over the second code channel is very confusing.
  - c) Regarding claim 5, it is unclear and confusing because signal from the first source device is stored in the first source device.
  - d) Regarding claims 10 and 16, render the same confusion as claim 1.
- Appropriate correction is required.

Applicants have cancelled Claim 5, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's objections to this claim. Applicants believe that the amendments made to Claims 1, 10 and 16 overcome the above objections to these claims.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112:

Claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that the limitations "estimating a signal" recited in claims 1 and 10 are confusing and unclear and that the limitations "absolute value of

Appl. No. 09/982,279  
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2006

Docket No. CM01989G  
Customer No. 22917

the signal" recited in Claims 19 and 20 are unclear. Applicants have cancelled Claim 20, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejections of this claim. Applicants believe that their amendments to Claims 1, 10 further clarifying the recitations "estimating a signal" and their amendments to Claim 19 deleting the recitations "absolute value of the signal" overcome the Examiner's §112 rejections of these claims.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102:**

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson (US 7,782,264). Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants have cancelled Claim 20 thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of this claim. Applicants submit that their amendments to Claim 19 overcome the Examiner's §102 rejections of Claim 19.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103:**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laakso, et al. (USPN 5,898,740). Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laakso, et al. (USPN 5,898,740) in view of Reichman, et al. (USPN 6,535,716), and Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laakso, et al. (USPN 5,898,740) in view of Hunzinger (US 2002/0058528). Applicants have cancelled Claims 5 and 11, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejection of these claims. Applicants traverse the remaining rejections.

Applicants have further clarified the language in Claims 1, 10 and 16 in support of their previous arguments that neither the primary reference Laakso nor any of the secondary references (in this most recent office action Reichman and Hunzinger) teaches or otherwise discloses a method or apparatus using multiple transmission passes as is included in amended Claims 1, 10 and 16. More particularly, the clarifications to claims 1, 10 and 16 clearly distinguished a "transmission pass" used in the claims from a "transmission channel" used in the cited references, thereby more clearly demonstrating the differences between the cited references

Appl. No. 09/982,279  
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2006

Docket No. CM01969G  
Customer No. 22917

and the inventions embodied in the claims of this application. Moreover, neither the primary reference Laakso nor any of the secondary references teaches or otherwise discloses two or more source device signals being received on a single or "common" code channel as is included in amended Claims 1, 10 and 16. Applicants further direct the Examiner to their arguments in their previous amendment filed on September 14, 2005, which arguments will not be repeated here for the sake of brevity but are fully supported by Applicants additional claim amendments included in this paper.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

By:



Valerie M. Davis  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847-576-6733  
Fax No.: 847-576-0721

Attachments